

### **REMARKS**

Claims 18-20 are currently pending in this application. As a result of this Response, no claims have been amended or added. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the arguments and remarks contained herein.

### **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 AND § 103**

Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Laursen, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,895,234). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as discussed below. Additionally, Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laursen, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,895,234) in view of Lawande, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,219,697). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as discussed below.

Laursen et al. discloses that a telephone number, an IP-address, a password and a subscriber number are sent to a server. However, neither of the telephone number, the IP-address, the password and the subscriber number is a code identifying a maker of a mobile phone (this is referred to as an M-ID in the specification of the present invention). The telephone number, the IP-address and the subscriber number are transferred to another mobile phone terminal when the user changes his mobile phone terminal to a new terminal made by another maker. Therefore, these numbers cannot be a code for identifying a maker of the mobile terminal. In addition, it is clear that the password does not identify a maker of the mobile terminal. In Laursen et al., there is no

disclosure that contents of the server are permitted to be downloaded only for mobile terminals that are made by a specified maker.

The Examiner may have recognized that the device ID (140) shown in Fig. 2b of Laursen et al. corresponds to the M-ID of the present invention. If it is assumed that the device ID corresponds to the M-ID of the present invention, the device ID itself is not sent to an exclusive server through a provider's server. Moreover, in Laursen et al., both of the IP address identifying the provider and the device ID are not checked by the exclusive server, and the specified information in the exclusive server is not permitted only when the IP address and the device ID are justified as authorized ones.


From the above reasons, the present invention defined in Claim 18 is quite different from Laursen et al. and cannot be anticipated by Laursen et al. Claims 19 and 20 are believed to be patentable because further limitations are added to Claim 18.

### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Final Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 29, 2006

By:   
Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MJS:MDF:mhe